



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/665,699	09/19/2003	Liang-Jie Zhang	SOM920030006US1	6039
59559 7590 05/27/2009 RYAN, MASON & LEWIS, LLP 90 FOREST AVENUE LOCUST VALLEY, NY 11560				
EXAMINER				
PARK, JEONG S				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2454				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/27/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/665,699

Applicant(s)

ZHANG ET AL.

Examiner

JEONG S. PARK

Art Unit

2454

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 4/6/2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13, 15-26 and 28-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13, 15-26 and 28-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF-08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/6/2009.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application.
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 4/6/2009 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 4/6/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

A. Summary of Applicant's Arguments

In the remarks, the applicant argues as followings:

Applicants note that the Huang reference, relied upon in the § 103(a) rejections of each of claims 1-13, 15-26 and 28-36, was first published when issued on August 26, 2003, which is the effective date of Huang under §102(a), Applicants believe that the claims of the Huang reference and the claims of the present application are neither directed to the same invention nor are obvious variants of one another. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the declaration is effective to remove Huang as §102(a) prior art.

B. Response to Arguments:

The declaration filed on 4/6/2009 under 37 CFR 1.131 has been considered but is ineffective to overcome the Huang reference.

The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish a conception of the invention prior to the effective date of the Huang reference. While conception is the mental part of the inventive act, it must be capable of proof, such as by demonstrative evidence or by a complete disclosure to another. Conception is more than a vague idea of how to solve a problem. The requisite means themselves and their interaction must also be comprehended. See *Mergenthaler v. Scudder*, 1897 C.D. 724, 81 O.G. 1417 (D.C. Cir. 1897). The applicant provided Exhibit 1 (IBM disclosure SOM8-2003-0001) does not disclose the claimed limitation as claimed in the application (see, e.g., applicant's published specification paragraph [0017]-[0022]).

The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish diligence from a date prior to the date of reduction to practice of the Huang reference to either a constructive reduction to practice or an actual reduction to practice. The applicant just stated that "between July 31, 2003 and September 19, 2003, William E. Lewis of Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP, worked diligently on the preparation of the above-referenced patent application and communicated with us regularly to obtain further information and to keep us apprised of his progress." without any supporting facts during the critical

period.

715.07(a) Diligence

Where conception occurs prior to the date of the reference, but reduction to practice is afterward, it is not enough merely to allege that applicant or patent owner had been diligent. *Ex parte Hunter*, 1889 C.D. 218, 49 O.G. 733 (Comm'r Pat. 1889). Rather, applicant must show evidence of facts establishing diligence.

In determining the sufficiency of a 37 CFR 1.131 affidavit or declaration, diligence need not be considered unless conception of the invention prior to the effective date is clearly established, since diligence comes into question only after prior conception is established. *Ex parte Kantor*, 177 USPQ 455 (Bd. App. 1958).

What is meant by diligence is brought out in *Christie v. Seybold*, 1893 C.D. 515, 64 O.G. 1650 (6th Cir. 1893). In patent law, an inventor is either diligent at a given time or he is not diligent; there are no degrees of diligence. An applicant may be diligent within the meaning of the patent law when he or she is doing nothing, if his or her lack of activity is excused. Note, however, that the record must set forth an explanation or excuse for the inactivity; the USPTO or courts will not speculate on possible explanations for delay or inactivity. See *In re Nelson*, 420 F.2d 1079, 164 USPQ 458 (CCPA 1970). Diligence must be judged on the basis of the particular facts in each case. See MPEP § 2138.06 for a detailed discussion of the diligence requirement for proving prior invention.

Under 37 CFR 1.131, the critical period in which diligence must be shown begins just prior to the effective date of the reference or activity and ends with the date of a reduction to practice, either actual or constructive (i.e., filing a United States patent application). Note, therefore, that only diligence before reduction to practice is a material consideration. The "lapse of time between the completion or reduction to practice of an invention and the filing of an application thereon" is not relevant to an affidavit or declaration under 37 CFR 1.131. See *Ex parte Merz*, 75 USPQ 296 (Bd. App. 1947). Form paragraph 7.62 (reproduced in MPEP § 715) may be used to respond to a 37 CFR 1.131 affidavit where diligence is lacking.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-5, 9-13, 16-26, 28-34 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson et al. (hereinafter Johnson)(U.S. Patent No. 2003/0023679 A1) in view of Hugh et al. (hereinafter Hugh)(U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0089551 A1), and further in view of Huang et al. (hereinafter Huang)(U.S. Patent No. 6,611,835 B1).

Regarding claims 1, 29, and 36, Johnson teaches as follows:

A method or an article of manufacture for use by at least one entity (client workstation (originator), reference character 50 in figure 2) in participating in a collaborative information exchange with at least one other entity (client workstation (receiver), reference character 52 in figure 2)(collaboration between networked computer users, see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0018]), the method comprising the steps of:

Obtaining annotation data (URL of the content), the annotation data comprising one or more links (URL) to information associated with the collaborative information exchange (the transmission of the collaborative content and the subject drawing by exchanging the URL of the content and rendering instructions as part of that URL, see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0023]) and comprising at least one hierarchical representation defining one or more of (i) an indication of organizational data entities; (ii) a specification of collaborating entities; (iii) a specification of content type pertinent to collaborating entities (iv) a specification of access control information; (v) a specification of dependency information for organizational data entities; and (vi) a specification of a type

of business construct defining collaboration activity (the encoded representation of collaborative content comprises of rendering instructions as part of URL which is the same as the specification of content type pertinent to collaborating entities, see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0023]); and

Transmitting at least a portion of the annotation data (URL of the content) to the at least one other entity (a client workstation or receiver) such that the at least one other entity may access at least a portion of the information associated with the collaborative information exchange by selecting at least one of the one or more links (the collaborative content transmitted to a client workstation (receiver) need only include a URL and rendering instructions to enable a user to view the collaborative content, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0027], lines 16-20) and may utilize at least a portion of the annotation data defined in the at least one hierarchical representation (once the collaborative content with the annotation is received by the receiver, the receiver can become an originator and create collaborative content or revise the collaborative content, see, e.g., page 5, paragraph [0062]); and

Selecting at least one of the one or more links (the client workstation receives the collaborative content data only including a URL by selects the URL see, e.g., page 5, paragraph [0062]).

Johnson does not explicitly teach the annotation data as a hierarchical representation.

Huge teaches as follows:

One hierarchical representation is structured to be capable of an indication of organizational data entities (Semi-Hierarchical arrangement allows users to store information in a purely hierarchical structure. For example a company may wish to store information organized by the management divisions within the company, see, e.g., page 17, paragraph [0192]);

The TeamBrain allows thoughts can contain files, web page shortcuts, network file shortcuts and annotation notes (see, e.g., page 17, paragraph [0192]); and

The TeamBrain server (3170 in figure 38) provides an ideal context for collaborative communication and allows people to view relationships among the various pieces of information (see, e.g., page 34, paragraph [0563]).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Johnson to include hierarchical structure information used in collaborative communication as taught by Huge in order to effectively provide collaborating people much larger global picture of stored documents by clearly indicating relationships among the stored documents.

Johnson in view of Huge does not explicitly teach of the annotation data comprising metadata associated with at least one target document of the one or more links.

Huang teaches as follows:

Creating metadata associated with links (the crawlers generate XML encoded RDF summaries which include among other metadata, a list of annotations made by

parent-URLs and a list of annotations made about child-URLs, see, e.g., col. 5, lines 1-7);

Metadata associated with Web sources (metadata refers to data describing Web sources and the metadata is about a particular Web page includes link-structure information which describes the hyperlinks to and from the given page, see, e.g., col. 5, lines 18-49); and

Metadata used with the summary page (the crawler generates a summary page for each page that it fetches using such metadata, see, e.g., col. 5, lines 50-61).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Huang with Johnson in view of Huge to include generating metadata includes the annotations information of Web pages as taught by Huang in order to provide summary of Web pages along with URLs of the Web pages among collaborating group.

Also it would be obvious to select a Web page (equivalent to applicant's link) based on the metadata provides summaries of Web pages.

Regarding claims 2 and 20, Johnson teaches that the selection of a link permits the at least one other entity to access the information on a need basis (the receiver sends the encoded representation of collaborative content to server to display it on receiver's station, see, e.g., page 5, paragraph [0062], lines 1-5).

Regarding claims 3 and 21, Johnson teaches that a link may be selected by the at least one other entity at a time not contemporaneous with the time of receipt of the annotation data (providing non-real time collaboration by posting the encoded

representation of collaborative content on message boards, news groups, see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0025]).

Regarding claims 4, 22, and 32, Johnson teaches that the annotation data is schema-less (the server process, reference character 53 in figure 2, receives an encoded representation of the collaborative content as a URL and render the content for presentation on the client workstations with rendering instructions given as part of that URL, see, e.g., page 5, paragraph [0063], lines 16-21, figure 4 and page 2, paragraph [0023]).

Regarding claims 5 and 23, Johnson teaches that the step of embedding information in a message transferred between the at least one entity and the at least one other entity (rendering instructions, see, e.g., page 6, paragraph [0070], lines 9-13, and encoded annotations, see, e.g., page 7, paragraph [0073], are embedded in the collaborative content).

Regarding claims 9 and 24, Johnson teaches that messages exchanged are governed by one or more message exchange patterns (see, e.g., page 5 paragraph [0061] and figure 7).

Regarding claim 10, Johnson teaches that one or more message exchange patterns comprise at least one of a construct (originator primitive and recipient primitive) and a primitive (originator or recipient)(see, e.g., page 5 paragraph [0061] and figure 7).

Regarding claim 11, Johnson teaches that the one or more message exchange patterns control at least one of non-structural and non-deterministic information exchange flow (collaboration between networked computer users does not require a

dedicated collaboration application on the user's computer system, see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0018] and the server process renders the content for presentation on the client workstations with rendering instructions given as part of that URL, see, e.g., page 5, paragraph [0063], lines 16-21 and page 2, paragraph [0023]).

Regarding claims 12 and 25, Johnson teaches that the obtaining step further comprises retrieving the annotation data from storage (the encoded collaborative content contains URL referencing the base document which is stored in a persistent base document storage, reference character 55 in figure 2, see, e.g., page 5, paragraph [0059], lines 10-12 and page 6, paragraph [0072], lines 11-12).

Regarding claims 13 and 26, Johnson teaches that the obtaining step further comprises generating the annotation data (the originator generates the encoded representation of collaborative content, see, e.g., page 5, paragraph [0061], lines 11-18 and figure 7, step 71).

Regarding claims 16, 17, and 28, Johnson teaches that the collaborative information exchange is performed in accordance with a design collaboration application and at least one collaborating entity (originator, 50 in figure 2) communicates with the design collaboration application (network collaboration system is utilized in the drawing process between the originator and the recipient, see, e.g., page 6, paragraph [0069] and figure 6).

Regarding claim 18, Johnson teaches modifying at least one of the annotation data and organizational data, based on changes in at least one of project, task and people assignments (see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0022]).

Regarding claim 19, Johnson teaches as follows:

An apparatus for use by at least one entity (client workstation: originator, reference character 50 in figure 2) in participating in a collaborative information exchange with at least one other entity (client workstation: receiver, reference character 52 in figure 2) (collaboration between networked computer users, see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0018]);

The apparatus comprising a memory (reference character 16 in figure 1) and at least one processor (reference character 14 in figure 1) coupled to the memory operative (see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0029], lines 1-5 and figure 1);

To obtain annotation data, wherein the annotation data is interpreted as an encoded representation of collaborative content (the originator generates the encoded representation of collaborative content and send it to the receiver via a server, see, e.g., page 5, paragraph [0061], lines 11-18 and figure 7);

The annotation data (encoded representation of collaborative content) comprising one or more links (URL part one and two) to information associated with the collaborative information exchange (the encoded representation of collaborative content consists of URL part one and two, the URL part one and two contain the base document or content identifier, its location on a document repository, and detailed viewing information and encoded annotations, see, e.g., page 6, paragraph [0072], page 7, paragraph [0073] and figure 5); and

To transmit at least a portion of the annotation data to the at least one other entity such that the at least one other entity may access at least a portion of the

information associated with the collaborative information exchange by selecting at least one of the one or more links (once the encoded representation of collaborative content is received by the receiver, the receiver sends it to the server to display by receiver, see, e.g., page 5, paragraph [0062] and figure 7, step 74-76).

Johnson does not explicitly teach the annotation data as a hierarchical representation.

Huge teaches as follows:

One hierarchical representation is structured to be capable of an indication of organizational data entities (Semi-Hierarchical arrangement allows users to store information in a purely hierarchical structure. For example a company may wish to store information organized by the management divisions within the company, see, e.g., page 17, paragraph [0192]);

The TeamBrain allows thoughts can contain files, web page shortcuts, network file shortcuts and annotation notes (see, e.g., page 17, paragraph [0192]); and

The TeamBrain server (3170 in figure 38) provides an ideal context for collaborative communication and allows people to view relationships among the various pieces of information (see, e.g., page 34, paragraph [0563]).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Johnson to include hierarchical structure information used in collaborative communication as taught by Huge in order to effectively provide collaborating people much larger global picture of stored documents by clearly indicating relationships among the stored documents.

Johnson in view of Huge does not explicitly teach of the annotation data comprising metadata associated with at least one target document of the one or more links.

Huang teaches as follows:

Creating metadata associated with links (the crawlers generate XML encoded RDF summaries which include among other metadata, a list of annotations made by parent-URLs and a list of annotations made about child-URLs, see, e.g., col. 5, lines 1-7);

Metadata associated with Web sources (metadata refers to data describing Web sources and the metadata is about a particular Web page includes link-structure information which describes the hyperlinks to and from the given page, see, e.g., col. 5, lines 18-49); and

Metadata used with the summary page (the crawler generates a summary page for each page that it fetches using such metadata, see, e.g., col. 5, lines 50-61).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Huang with Johnson in view of Huge to include generating metadata includes the annotations information of Web pages as taught by Huang in order to provide summary of Web pages along with URLs of the Web pages among collaborating group.

Also it would be obvious to select a Web page (equivalent to applicant's link) based on the metadata provides summaries of Web pages.

Regarding claim 30, Johnson teaches an apparatus comprising:

An annotation data generation tool for generating annotation data (originator generates the collaborative content, see, e.g., page 5, paragraph [0061], lines 1-5);

A collaborative directory coupled to the annotation data generation tool for storing the generated annotation data (persistent base document storage, reference character 55 in figure 2, see, e.g., page 5, paragraph [0059]); and

An annotation data manager (server process, reference character 53 in figure 2) coupled to the collaborative directory for managing the annotation data (see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0026] and figure 2).

Johnson does not explicitly teach the annotation data as a hierarchical representation.

Huge teaches as follows:

One hierarchical representation is structured to be capable of an indication of organizational data entities (Semi-Hierarchical arrangement allows users to store information in a purely hierarchical structure. For example a company may wish to store information organized by the management divisions within the company, see, e.g., page 17, paragraph [0192]);

The TeamBrain allows thoughts can contain files, web page shortcuts, network file shortcuts and annotation notes (see, e.g., page 17, paragraph [0192]); and

The TeamBrain server (3170 in figure 38) provides an ideal context for collaborative communication and allows people to view relationships among the various pieces of information (see, e.g., page 34, paragraph [0563]).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Johnson to include hierarchical structure information used in collaborative communication as taught by Huge in order to effectively provide collaborating people much larger global picture of stored documents by clearly indicating relationships among the stored documents.

Johnson in view of Huge does not explicitly teach of the annotation data comprising metadata associated with at least one target document of the one or more links.

Huang teaches as follows:

Creating metadata associated with links (the crawlers generate XML encoded RDF summaries which include among other metadata, a list of annotations made by parent-URLs and a list of annotations made about child-URLs, see, e.g., col. 5, lines 1-7);

Metadata associated with Web sources (metadata refers to data describing Web sources and the metadata is about a particular Web page includes link-structure information which describes the hyperlinks to and from the given page, see, e.g., col. 5, lines 18-49); and

Metadata used with the summary page (the crawler generates a summary page for each page that it fetches using such metadata, see, e.g., col. 5, lines 50-61).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Huang with Johnson in view of Huge to include generating metadata includes the annotations information of Web pages as taught by Huang in

order to provide summary of Web pages along with URLs of the Web pages among collaborating group.

Also it would be obvious to select a Web page (equivalent to applicant's link) based on the metadata provides summaries of Web pages.

Regarding claim 31, Johnson teaches the annotation data manager is responsive to a collaboration pattern, the collaboration pattern representing iterative actions that may occur between the one entity and the at least one other entity (see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0026], figure 2 and page 5, paragraph [0061], figure 7).

Regarding claim 33, Johnson teaches a web-based interface for use in participating in the collaborative information exchange (see, e.g., page 5, paragraph [0063] and figure 4).

Regarding claim 34, Johnson teaches the collaborative directory serves as a hub for managing collaborative resources of multiple organizations that use the hub as a central place to perform business collaboration (server and persistent base document storage together serve as a hub for managing collaborative resources, see, e.g., page 5, paragraph [0059] and page 2, paragraph [0026]).

5. Claims 6-8 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson et al. (hereinafter Johnson)(U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0023679 A1) in view of Hugh et al. (hereinafter Hugh)(U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0089551 A1), Huang et al. (hereinafter Huang)(U.S. Patent No. 6,611,835 B1), and further in view of Atkins et al. (hereinafter Atkins)(U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0097410 A1).

Regarding claims 6-8, Johnson discloses the embedded information in a message (rendering instructions, see, e.g., page 6, paragraph [0070], lines 9-13, and encoded annotations, see, e.g., page 7, paragraph [0073], are embedded in the collaborative content) as explained above.

Johnson does not disclose a status tracking function of the embedded information to cause notification in the form of an alert type.

Atkins teaches as follows:

A system provides an online service for facilitating collaboration among several individuals across a data network (see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0034], lines 1-3 and figure 3);

A status tracking function for the collaborative information (shared collection of objects)(network service site, reference character 320 in figure 3, tracks changes or comments made to the shared collection of objects, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0038], lines 1-5);

A portion of the embedded information is employed to cause notification of one or more entities (the other collaborators) about a status of an action (the network service site dispatches update notifications to the other collaborators, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0038], lines 1-5); and

The notification is in the form of an alert type (forming of an alert type is inherent when sending notification message to the others via the asynchronous messaging channel, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0038], lines 1-5).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Johnson-Hugh-Huang to include providing notifications to the other collaborators for any change or comment made to the shared collection of objects as taught by Atkins in order to update the shared message (the shared collection of objects) quickly and promptly between the at least one entity and the at least one other entity (collaborators).

Regarding claim 15, Johnson in view of Hugh and Huang does not disclose for determining an individual or an authority to be notified.

Atkins discloses that the repository, reference character 320 in figure 3, sends asynchronous messages including the URL to the collaborating clients, 330 in figure 3, notifying them of the new updates contributed to the objects (see, e.g., page 7, paragraph [0073], lines 19-26).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Johnson in view of Hugu and Huang to include sending notifications to the determined individual or authority as taught by Atkins in order to update the shared message quickly and promptly between collaborators.

6. Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart et al. (hereinafter Stewart)(U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0156693 A1) in view of Johnson et al. (hereinafter Johnson)(U.S. Patent No. 2003/0023679 A1), and further in view of Huang et al. (hereinafter Huang)(U.S. Patent No. 6,611,835 B1).

Regarding claim 35, Stewart teaches as follows:

A method of deploying a business collaboration system (an open market collaboration system for enterprise wide electronic commerce, see, e.g., abstract and figure 20), the method comprising the steps of:

Deploying at least one on-demand business collaboration (identify the trading partners desired for the collaboration after determining the types of business transactions based on an business strategy, which means the system deploys the collaboration based on the demand, see, e.g., page 13, paragraph [0239]) hyperchain-based (communicating using XML messages between the workflow server and the collaboration server, see, e.g., page 11, paragraph [0172]) management apparatus for use in one or more of (see, e.g., page 13, paragraph [0237]);

Defining at least one business collaboration process template (determine the types of business transactions to be conducted, see, e.g., page 13, paragraph [0239], lines 2-5 and);

Creating at least one set of data constructs (configuring the types of messages, see, e.g., page 13, paragraph [0241], lines 11-13);

Selecting at least one other collaborating entity (trading partners) for information exchange capable of acting on at least one set of business constructs (identify the trading partners desired for the collaboration, see, e.g., page 13, paragraph [0239], lines 6-8);

Customizing a process template to support a selected set of business constructs (define the collaboration process and trading partner roles, see, e.g., page 13,

paragraph [0241], lines 1-7 and also see, e.g., page 11, paragraph [0170], lines 8-12);
and

Generating at least one set of activities in a business construct with initial collaborative data entities (begin trading activities, see, e.g., page 13, paragraph [0245]).

Stewart does not explicitly teach of exchanging schema-less hierarchical annotation linkage.

Johnson in view of Huang teaches of exchanging schema-less hierarchical annotation linkage as presented above per claims 1.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Stewart with Johnson in view of Huang to include exchanging metadata with Web pages as taught by Johnson-Huang in order to provide summary of Web pages along with URLs of the Web pages among collaborating group.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JEONG S. PARK whose telephone number is (571)270-1597. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:00 - 3:30 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached on 571-272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/J. S. P./
Examiner, Art Unit 2454

May 12, 2009

***/Nathan J. Flynn/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2454***